

**PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY/FRAUD PREVENTION
SUBCOMMITTEE**

August 12, 2004

Attendance:

Rick Zynda, DHFS/DHCF/BEM; Richard Basiliere, Outagamie County DHHS; Gene Kucharski, Portage County; Charles Billings, DHFS/DHCF; Barry Chase, DHFS/DHCF; Richard Eddings, Dane County; Sandy Leonard and Mary Obermayr, Interstate Reporting Co.; Steve Ploeser, DHFS/DHCF; Fay Simonini, DWD/DWS; Sheila Drays, Dodge County; Jim Hennen, DHFS/OSF/SERO; Theresa Fosbinder, DHFS/DHCF

Phone In attendees:

Jim Borgerson, Douglas County

Meeting called to order at 9:40 am by Rick Zynda

June Minutes were approved with the following changes: Nancy Foss and Virginia Wiedenfeld were not present.

Bureau Program Integrity/ FRAUD Prevention (PIFP) TEAM

This group was formed in June and had its first meeting in July. Rick handed out a document showing the functions of the Team and which Sections and staff are responsible for each function. The group consists of people from many different areas within the bureau including FS and Medicaid Policy, Communications, Training, and IT systems.

Purpose of the PIFP Team:

1. Identify people who commit fraud and recover.
2. Deter Fraud
3. Measure cost effectiveness

The Team will be setting goals and priorities. They will need to start with baseline Federal and State requirements for fraud and front-end verification – laws, regulations, etc. to identify what is optional vs what is required.

Data Collection

Rich B. suggested that, regarding the document titled "Fraud Programs Functions in the Eligibility Bureau in DHFS", under DHFS Scope of work, that item 2A (Training and Technical Assistance) be clarified to include investigators employed by local agencies. The document had stated that ES workers and contracted fraud investigators be provided training and technical assistance on fraud policy and fraud reporting (proper completion of CARES screens).

Fraud Plans

Reimbursement cap of \$500.00 – should it be lifted? Need to develop a recommendation for discussion with the full IMAC group.

IMAC is hesitant to make any significant program changes for 2005 due to overall IM funding and workload concerns, and wants to look at potential changes for 2006, based on funding provided in the next State Biennial Budget.

Investigations – Administrators Memo

An Administrators Memo is being drafted to request local agencies to indicate to DHFS how they will administer investigations in 2005, to allow The Department to plan for 2005 contracts. The memo will ask if the agency will provide investigation services using:

- Local agency staff
- Local agency contract
- State-contracted provider (IRC)

Agencies must respond to the request by Sept 30th.

LAB Report

LAB report has still not been published. LAB is finalizing the draft. DHFS will then have a chance to review before the final is issued.

Food stamp Management Evaluation Review (MER)

Marilyn Rudd is working on the 2005 MER document. Will contact about a third of the local agencies each year and give them a questionnaire about their Program Integrity/Fraud program. Rick handed out a draft set of questions prepared by Marilyn. She would like feedback within 2 weeks.

One suggestion was made that question #11 ("Has the DA identified a standard referral process that includes types of data, data format, Data organization, etc"), should include a \$ threshold amount of how much of an overpayment there should be before a referral is made.

Charles Billings brought up the issue that some of the information that was being asked on the document is data that local agencies are supposed to be entering on CARES. He suggested rewording some of the questions and perhaps have some additional questions about whether they are entering the information on CARES, and if not how they are collecting and recording it (do they have their own database).

There was also a comment that local administrators may be reluctant to respond to questions that may indicate they are not meeting all of their IM contract requirements. Should these questions be given directly to people closer to the front lines? Jim Hennen, SE Regional Office, who is on the MER workgroup, and involved in conducting the MERs, said that generally several levels of local staff are present during the MER review to provide detailed information.

Gene Kucharski brought up the fact that the MER focuses on Food Stamps, can it be expanded to cover other programs? If not should we make it clear that we are only asking about Food Stamps, since the fraud, recovery and corrective action programs are combined for all programs at the local agencies. Jim Hennen said that a small portion of the questions included MA and that information is gathered if FS activities involve other programs as well.

Theresa Fosbinder on Training:

Training is important. In trying to get the most out of our training resources, the Department is planning to use Distance Learning wherever possible. There will still be situations when face to face training will be needed. Gene brought up that some people need some basic computer skills training, and can spend a lot of time just getting into the computer software to do the distance learning. Theresa said they are exploring the idea of having a training support desk open during normal business that would be available to people doing various types of distance learning.

More detailed information from Theresa's presentation is available on the PowerPoint she presented (see attachment). The link to the PTS Learning Center on the web is WWW.DWD.STATE.WI.US/DWSPTS.

Cathy Judd will be conducting a workshop on training at the WAPAF conference in October

Workload and Finance Committee/Biennial Budget

There is discussion in DHCF about the possibility and implications of adding 'error prone profile' as a criterion for 2nd party reviews as a means of coordinating the 2nd Party Review process with Front End Verification. Some in the Committee feel that there is a difference in the role and functions of the ES 2nd Party reviewer compared to that of the investigator. Further discussion on this issue will be continued at next months meeting, allowing the committee to have some time to think about the concept and how this might work, pros/cons, etc.

Next meeting: September 9, 2004, 9:30 am – 11:45 am (NOTE: Ending time changed due to a Bureau Meeting in the afternoon for State staff)